UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,250	01/23/2002	Russell T. Davis	7643.0042	1920

7590   03/22/2005

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/052,250	DAVIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 January 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-64</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-64</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/15/2002 and</u>. 11/16/2003

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-64 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement filed on 01/16/2003 fails to comply

with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent

document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it

to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein

has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not
> be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-

63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, US

Patent No. 6,370,549 and further in view of Polizzi et al. (Polizzi), US Patent

Application Publication No. 2002/0052954.

5.   As to claims 1, 17, 29, 30, 42, 54, and 62, Saxton discloses a data

processing system for developing reports, comprising:

        a parser that receives one or more text documents and creates software

elements having a format with a hierarchal relationship between the software

elements based on the one or more text documents (Abstract, col. 5, lines 63 –

col. 6, lines 16); and

        However, Saxton does not explicitly disclose an editor that develops

reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text

documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or

more values within the report. Polizzi discloses in Abstract, page 3, paragraph

[0024] and page 6, paragraph [0039]: a repository stores all computer files, which

are called objects, and the objects can be any computer file such as text

documents; these text documents are organized or arranged in a hierarchy).

Polizzi also discloses preparing a report based upon retrieved data (Abstract). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include

develops reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or

more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent

one or more values within the report in order to allow user to view and select reports.

6.   As to claims 2, 18, 31, 43, 55 and 63, Saxton and Polizzi (Saxton-Polizzi) disclose wherein the format with the hierarchal relationship between the software elements is a Numerator Document Object Model (NDOM) (Saxton, Abstract).

7.   As to claim 5, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein a manager manipulates the software elements (Saxton, col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 65).

8.   As to claims 6, 21, 34, and 46, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the manager manipulates the software elements by browsing, editing, loading, and storing the software elements (Saxton, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 11; Polizzi, Abstract, and page 1, paragraphs [0005]-[0006]).

9.   As to claims 7, 22, 35, and 47, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein a mapper generates a relationship between the data from the one or more sources and the one or more values to be placed within the report (Polizzi, Abstract, page 3, paragraph [0024] and page 6, paragraph [0039]: a repository stores all computer files, which are called objects, and the objects can be any computer file such as text documents; these text documents are organized or arranged in a hierarchy). Polizzi also discloses preparing a report based upon retrieved data (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include develops reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report in order to allow user to view and select reports).

10.   As to claim 11, Saxton-Polizzi wherein a mapper links the report and the one or more sources that will present one or more values within the report (Polizzi, pages 3-4, paragraphs [0025]-[0026]).

11.   As to claims 12, 24, 37 and 49, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the report and the one or more sources are linked through a "drag and drop" process (Saxton, col. 1, line 61 – col. 2, line 12 and col. 7, lines 12-24).

12.   As to claims 13, 25, 38, 50, and 59, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the editor provides for the software elements to be modified to create a new combination of software elements representative of a new text document (Polizzi, page 4, paragraph [0027]).

13.   As to claims 14, 26, 39, 51, and 60, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the editor provides for modification of one or more parameters associated with the software elements (Polizzi, page 4, paragraph [0027]).

14.   As to claims 15, 27, 40, 52 and 61, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the software elements are transformed to new software elements and are imported into an RDL system (Polizzi, page 2, paragraph [0008]).

15.   As to claims 16, 28, 41, and 53, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the software elements are transformed to the new software elements by retrieving a tag associated with each of the software elements in a dictionary and invoking a translation routine associated with the tag (Saxton, col. 7, line 44 – col. 10, line 30).

16.   Claims 3-4, 19-20, 32-33, 44-45, 56-57, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, and Polizzi et al. (Polizzi) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 above, and further in view of Hamscher et al. (Hamscher), published by July 31, 2000.

17.   As to claims 3, 19, 32, 44, 56 and 64, Saxton-Polizzi, however, do not disclose wherein the one or more text documents are XBRL documents. Hamscher discloses XBRL consists of a core language of XML elements and attributes used in document instances as well as a language used to define new elements and taxonomies of elements referred to in document instances (pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamscher and Saxton-Polizzi to

include XBRL documents because XBRL documents allow software vendors, programmers and end users who adopt it as a specification to enhance the creation, exchange, and comparison of business reporting information.

18.   As to claims 4, 20, 33, 45, and 57, Saxton-Polizzi-Hamscher disclose wherein the parser creates the software elements having the format with the hierarchal relationship by interpreting tags included in the one or more text documents (Hamscher, page 7).

19.   Claims 8-10, 23, 36, 48, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, and Polizzi et al. (Polizzi) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 above, and further in view of Clancey et al. (Clancey), US Patent No. 6,134,563.

20.   As to claim 8, Saxton-Polizzi, however, do not explicitly disclose wherein one or more templates are used to develop the report. Clancey discloses a user can create and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users.

21.   As to claims 9, 23, 36, and 58, Saxton-Polizzi and Clancey (Saxton-Polizzi-Clancey) disclose wherein the one or more templates contain data that is directly inserted into the report and instructions enabling data from the one or more sources to be inserted into the report (Clancey discloses a user can create and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users).

22.   As to claims 10 and 48, Saxton-Polizzi-Clancey disclose wherein the one or more templates provide instructions to a mapper to retrieve the data that is directly inserted into the report and data from local or remote sources (Clancey discloses a user can create and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users).

23.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER